

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Acknowledgement of Amendment***

Applicants amendment filed on 06/19/2009 overcome the following objection(s)/rejection(s):

The rejection of claim 27 under §1.75(d) (1), has been withdrawn in view of Applicants amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-26 and 28-30 under 35. U.S.C. §101 has been withdrawn in view of Applicants amendments.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 06/19/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. As to Applicants argument regarding the amendments to claims 1 and 16 overcome the rejection of these claims 1-26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.
3. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification discloses that the term "computer readable media" is also used to represent carrier waves on which the software is transmitted. Further, such functions correspond to modules, which are software, hardware, firmware, or any combination thereof. Multiple, function are performed in one or more modules as desired, and the embodiments described are merely examples. The software is executed on a digital signal processor, ASIC, microprocessor, or other type of processor operating on a computer system, such as a personal computer, server or other computer system, [0021]. Further, paragraph [0047]

Art Unit: 2621

discloses a block diagram of a computer system that executes programming for performing the above algorithm is shown in FIG. 6. A general computing device in the form of a computer 610, may include a processing unit 602, memory 604, removable storage 612, and non-removable storage 614. Memory 604 may include volatile memory 606 and non-volatile memory 608. Computer 610 may include--or have access to a computing environment that includes--a variety of computer-readable media, such as volatile memory 606 and non-volatile memory 608, removable storage 612 and non-removable storage 614. Computer storage includes RAM, ROM, EPROM & EEPROM, flash memory or other memory technologies, CD ROM, Digital Versatile Disks (DVD) or other optical disk storage, magnetic cassettes, magnetic tape, magnetic disk storage or other magnetic storage devices, or any other medium capable of storing computer-readable instructions. Computer 610 may include or have access to a computing environment includes input 616, output 618, and a communication connection 620. The computer may operate in a networked environment using a communication connection to connect to one or more remote computers. The remote computer may include a personal computer, server, router, network PC, a peer device or other common network node, or the like. The communication connection may include a Local Area Network (LAN), a Wide Area Network (WAN) or other networks, [0047]. Thus as disclosed, by paragraphs [0022] and [0047] the media encompasses both statutory subject matter and non-statutory subject matter. Thus the Examiner maintains the 101 rejection.

4. As to Applicants argument regarding that the language "These area (i.e., the areas represented by the grey scale pixels that are not expected to have any motion) may be selected on initialization" provides support for the claim language, "prior to receiving the frames of the area," since one skilled in the art would know that initialization of a motion detection system occurs before any video frames are receive and processed by the system. The Applicant further respectfully submits that the language "The speed motion detection algorithm presents portions of images in grey scale pixels when such portions... are not expected to have motion" provides support for the claims language "as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest.". The Applicant further respectfully submits that a claim limitation need not be recited *ipissimis verbis* in the written description in order for the written description to provide adequate support for the claimed limitation. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

5. The Examine respectfully disagrees. Applicant does not have support for this claim limitation in the specification or disclosure. Note: the Examiner directs the Applicant to pg. 13 [0045] of Applicants original disclosure. Although Applicant has disclosed that the speed motion detection algorithm represents portions of image in grey scale pixel when such portions are not high in color content, or are not expected to have motion. These areas may be selected on initialization based on knowledge of an operator, or may be selected based on real time assessment of the scene. There is no positive recitation in application disclosure for the following claim language: "prior to the

Art Unit: 2621

receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest”.

6. As to Applicants argument that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis (as modified by Monroe and Flickner), and further disagrees that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Parker with Pavlidis (as modified by Monroe, Flickner and Gu).

7. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings Gu with Pavlidis (as modified by Monroe and Flickner) for providing improved efficient signal processing of color images. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gu discloses where other aspects of the invention involve methods for automated color correction carried out in the disclosed system. Predetermined color parameter statistical data, e.g., the lower edge, upper edge, and peak value of color distribution histograms for a plurality of selectable reference images, are stored in a reference memory, see col. 4 line 11-16. Further, Gu is related to processing of color image signals, and in particular, related to an improved system and

Art Unit: 2621

method for the automated correction of color video signals. It is particularly useful in digital systems for color correction and modification, col. 1 line 1-9. Further disclosed is color correction and modification is used in a number of applications within the television industry and other businesses which make use of video and other graphic image signals, col. 1 line 20-24. Further, Pavlidis discloses to use color cameras during the day and a high-resolution camera during the night, see V Optical and System Design. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis for providing improved efficient signal processing of color images.

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Parker with Pavlidis (as modified by Monroe, Flickner and Gu) for improving image processing. Parker teaches the skin detection algorithm utilizes color image segmentation and a pre-determined skin distribution in a specific color space, as :  $P(\text{skin.vertine.chrominance})$  [0045]. The Examiner relied upon Parkers teachings of the predetermined skin distribution in a specific color space, to the technique of having a predetermined specific color space prior to an image. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Park with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner and Gu) for providing improved image processing. Further, Parker is related to digital image processing, and more particularly to processing digital images and digital motion image sequences captured by high resolution digital cameras, [0001]. Further, discloses is

providing a method for generating an enhanced digital compressed digital image, thus improving image processing.

9. As to Applicants argument that the predetermined statistics regarding histograms is not a disclosure of a "pixel distribution [that] is preselected" in a motion detection system as recited in the claims.

10. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gu discloses where other aspects of the invention involve methods for automated color correction carried out in the disclosed system. Predetermined color parameter statistical data, e.g., the lower edge, upper edge, and peak value of color distribution histograms for a plurality of selectable reference images, are stored in a reference memory, see col. 4 line 11-16. Thus it is clear to the Examiner that Gu discloses to select the color distribution. The Examiner notes that a histogram represents a distribution.

11. As to Applicants argument that it would not have been obvious to incorporate Gu into Pavlidis because there is no reason to incorporate a predetermination of color parameter histogram data into a video surveillance system.

12. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gu discloses where other aspects of the invention involve methods for automated color correction carried out in the disclosed system. Predetermined color parameter statistical data, e.g., the lower edge, upper edge, and peak value of color distribution histograms for a plurality of selectable reference images, are stored in a reference memory, see col. 4 line 11-16. Further, Gu is related to processing of color image signals, and in particular, related to an improved system and method for the automated correction of color video signals. It is particularly

Art Unit: 2621

useful in digital systems for color correction and modification, col. 1 line 1-9. Further disclosed is color correction and modification is used in a number of applications within the television industry and other businesses which make use of video and other graphic image signals, col. 1 line 20-24. Further, Pavlidis discloses to use color cameras during the day and a high-resolution camera during the night, see V Optical And System Design. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis for providing improved efficient signal processing of color images.

13. As to Applicants argument that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

14. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gu is related to processing of color image signals, and in particular, related to an improved system and method for the automated correction of color video signals. It is particularly useful in digital systems for color correction and modification, col. 1 line 1-9. Further disclosed is color correction and modification is used in a number of applications within the television industry and other businesses which make use of video and other graphic image signals, col. 1 line 20-24. Further, Pavlidis discloses to use color cameras during the day and a high-resolution camera during the night, see V Optical And System Design. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis for providing improved efficient signal processing of color images.

15. As to Applicants argument that it would not have been obvious to combine Parker with Pavlidis since one of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reason to

Art Unit: 2621

apply skin color detection algorithm to a system for motion detection. Moreover, the rationale provided by the Office Action, is that the combination of Parker with Pavlidis would provide improved image processing, is simply too general a ration to establish a *prima facie case* of obviousness.

16. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Parker teaches the skin detection algorithm utilizes color image segmentation and a pre-determined skin distribution in a specific color space, as : P (skin.vertine.chrominance) [0045]. The Examiner relied upon Parkers teachings of the predetermined skin distribution in a specific color space, to the technique of having a predetermined specific color space prior to an image. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Park with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner and Gu) for providing improved image processing. Further, Parker is related to digital image processing, and more particularly to processing digital images and digital motion image sequences captured by high resolution digital cameras, [0001]. Further, discloses is providing a method for generating an enhanced digital compressed digital image, thus improving image processing.

17. As to Applicants argument that the Examiner is using the teachings of the Applicant's disclosure against the Applicants, that such use is improper, and that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established based on the Applicant's disclosure.

18. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

Art Unit: 2621

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

19. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
20. Regarding claim 1, Applicant has claimed ..."first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest".
21. Applicant does not have support for this claim limitation in the specification or disclosure. Note: the Examiner directs the Applicant to pg. 13 [0045] of Applicants original disclosure. Although Applicant has disclosed that the speed motion detection algorithm represents portions of image in grey scale pixel when such portions are not

Art Unit: 2621

high in color content, or are not expected to have motion. These areas may be selected on initialization based on knowledge of an operator, or may be selected based on real time assessment of the scene. There is no positive recitation in application disclosure for the following claim language: "prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest".

22. Claims 2-15 and 28-30 fail to remedy the issue as stated for claim 1. Thus, claims 2-15 and 28-30 are too rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

23. Re claim 16, Applicant has claimed ..."first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest". Applicant does not have support for this claim limitation in the specification or disclosure.

24. Re claims 15-26, fail to remedy the issue as stated for claim 16. Thus, claims 15-26 are too rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

25. Re claim 27, Applicant has claimed ..."first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest". Applicant does not have support for this claim limitation in the specification or disclosure.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

26. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Re claim 1, which recites a method for detecting motion in an area, the method comprising: " using a high speed motion detection algorithm..", the method is performed using an algorithm, taking the claim as a whole, the steps recited is a mathematical algorithm, i.e. abstract idea. As claimed, it does not perform a physical transformation, and/or produce a result that is useful, concrete and tangible (See Interim Guidelines, Annex 5: Mathematical algorithms).

Re claim 2-15, and 28-30, fail to remedy the issue for claim 1, thus claims 2-15 and 28-30 are also rejected as being non statutory for being dependent upon claim 1.

Re claim 16, see the rejection and rejection made claim 1, which recites a method for detecting motion in an area, the method comprising: " using a high speed motion detection algorithm..", the method is performed using an algorithm, taking the claim as a whole, the steps recited is a mathematical algorithm, i.e. abstract idea. As claimed, it does not perform a physical transformation, and/or produce a result that is useful, concrete and tangible (See Interim Guidelines, Annex 5: Mathematical algorithms).

Re claims 17-26 fail to remedy the issue for claim 1, thus claims 17-26 are also rejected as being non statutory for being dependent upon claim 16.

Re claim 27, which recites a system for detecting motion in a monitored area, the system, which falls within one of the four statutory classes of subject matter. However, taking the claim as a whole, the system is directed to a non-statutory subject matter, i.e., carrier wave, [0021].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

27. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

28. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

29. Claims 1-26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pavlidis et al., Urban Surveillance Systems 2001 in view of Monroe et al., US-2003/0025599 in view of Flickner et al., US-2003/0107649A1 and further in view of Gu et al., US-5, 874, 988 view of Parker et al., US-2003/0122942 A1.

Regarding **claim 1**, Pavlidis discloses a method of detecting motion in an area the method comprising: receiving at one or more processors frames of the area (Pavlidis, DETER, *Introduction* pg. 1478 and Fig. 3 and 4); using a high performance motion detection algorithm executing in the one or more processors on remaining frames to detect true motion from noise (Pavlidis, the connected component algorithm filters out blobs with area less than 27 pixels as noise, *C. Multiple Hypotheses Predictive Tracking* pg. 1448 and Section V). Pavlidis is silent in regards to using a high-

Art Unit: 2621

speed motion detection algorithm to remove frames in which a threshold amount of motion is not detected; wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest; and wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm is configured such that the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest; wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution associated with a second block of pixels. However, Monroe discloses a high-speed motion detection algorithm to remove frames in which a threshold amount of motion is not detected (only changes in the data need be transmitted; see page 4, paragraph [0032], [0033]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe) as a whole is silent in regards to wherein a wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm represents the frames, wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution that does not represent any motion of interest; wherein the plurality of the

Art Unit: 2621

frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution.

However, Flickner teaches wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution associated with a lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed limitation); a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates

Art Unit: 2621

at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Further disclosed is that shopping carts themselves (and moving inanimate objects generally) may be detected using color (step 140). The color of shopping carts may be modeled using a single 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that has a color similar to that distribution being classified as a pixel belonging to a shopping cart, [0032]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution, and distinguish objects using a 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that a color similar to distribution, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner discloses to represent foreground and background pixel in different color distributions associated with the presence of motion of the lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickner with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe) for allowing for more efficient tracking of persons and activities [0004].

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) is silent in regards to the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected.

However, Gu teaches the pixel distributions are pre-selected (column 4 lines 11-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) for providing efficient signal processing of color images.

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker and Gu) is silent in regards to the color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frame of the area.

However, Parker discloses where in the present invention, the skin detection algorithm utilizes color image segmentation and a pre-determined skin distribution in a specific color space, as: P (skin.vertline.chrominance) [0045]. Therefore, since Parker discloses a predetermined skin distribution in a specific color space, it is clear to the examiner that the predetermined specific color space is prior to an image, which reads upon the claimed limitation.

Now taking the teachings of Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker, and Gu) now incorporating Parkers teaching of predetermined color space prior to image, now teaches claim 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Parker with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, and Gu) for providing improved image processing.

Regarding **claim 2**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu and Parker) is silent in regards to the high-speed detection algorithm operates in a compressed image domain. However, Monroe teaches the high-speed detection algorithm operates in a compressed image domain (Monroe, [compressed digital images; page 4, paragraph [0028]]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified with Flickner ,Gu, Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 3**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to the high speed detection algorithm operates in an uncompressed image domain.

However, Monroe teaches the high speed detection algorithm operates in an uncompressed image domain (Monroe, optionally compressed; page 16, paragraph [0212]) image domain.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner,Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 4** Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) as a whole further teach the high performance detection algorithm operates in an image pixel domain (Pavlidis, motion segmentation through a multi-normal representation at the pixel level, pg 1482, first column).

Regarding **claim 5**, Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu, Parker) as a whole further teach the high speed motion detection algorithm represents portions of images in grey scale pixels (Pavlidis, *V. Optical and System Design*, pg 1482).

Regarding **claim 6**, Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu, Parker) as a whole further teach the image are represented in grey scale when such portions are not high in color content (Pavlidis, *V. Optical and System Design*, pg 1482).

Regarding **claim 7**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) as a whole further teach the selected portions of the images are low in color content (Pavlidis discloses the use of a dual channel camera system that uses a medium resolution color camera during the day, and a high resolution grey scale camera during the night, *V. Optical and System Design*, page 1482. Monroe discloses the ability to select areas of a selected scene for monitoring activity level paragraph [0044]).

Regarding **claim 8**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) as a whole further teach the portions are based on an initial set up (Pavlidis. VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking, *Initialization*, pg. 1484, Monroe discloses defaulting and programmable modes; page 4, paragraph [0028]).

Regarding **claim 9**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to wherein the selected portions are determined based on a real time assessment of dynamic change in the area. However, Monroe teaches wherein the selected portions are determined based on a real time assessment of dynamic change in the area (Monroe, [0045]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner ,Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 10**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker)) is silent in regards to the threshold is predetermined. However, Monroe teaches wherein the threshold is predetermined (defined threshold would be indicative of motion; page 8 paragraph [0115]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner , Gu, and Paker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 11**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to the area is a predetermined area. However, Monroe discloses the area is a predetermined area (remote; page 8 paragraph [0108]) area.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner , Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 12**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) as a whole further teach the frames comprise pixels, and where such pixels are group in blocks of pixel, each block being represented as an average or median in the color domain (Pavlidis, pg 1485, first column).

Regarding **claim 13**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to the blocks of pixels are of different sizes. However, Monroe teaches wherein the blocks of pixels are of different sizes (decimation various numbers of pixels will effectively change the sizes of pixel blocks; page 9 paragraph [0118]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner and Gu) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 14**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to the area requiring higher resolution to detect motion are represented by blocks of smaller number of pixels. However, Monroe teaches wherein portions of the area requiring resolution to detect motion are represented by blocks of smaller number of pixels (page 9, paragraph [0116] and fig. 2:21-24) Monroe discloses using the histogram to determine the degree of change, where pixels are grouped according the value of change.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and

Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 15**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to the number of pixels in the blocks is varied based on depth of field. However, Monroe teaches wherein the number of pixels in the block is varied based on depth of field (the degree of motion; page 9, paragraph [0121] and see fig. 3: 34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 16**, Pavlidis teach a method of detecting motion in an area (DETER, a prototype urban surveillance system, *Introduction*, pg 1478), the method comprising: receiving at one or more processors frames of the area (DETER, *Introduction* pg. 1478 and Fig. 3 and 4); using a high speed motion detection algorithm to remove frames in which a threshold of motion is not detected; using a high performance motion detection algorithm executing in the one or more on remaining frames to detect true motion from noise (Pavlidis, the connected component algorithm filters out blobs with area less than 27 pixel as noise VI. *C. Multiple Hypothesis Predictive Tracking*, pg. 1488), wherein the frames comprise pixel (motion segmentation though a multi-normal representation at the pixel level, pg 1482), and where such pixels

Art Unit: 2621

are grouped in blocks of pixels, each block being represented as a single average pixel (Jeffery's divergence measures pg 1485-1487); and initializing, using the one or processors, a model of the area comprising multiple weighted distributions for each block of pixels (mixture of Normals; Pavlidis, *III. Relevant Technical Work*, page 1481 and VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking: *A. Initializing*, page 1485-1487). Pavlidis is silent in regards to using a high-speed motion detection algorithm to remove frames in which a threshold amount of motion is not detected; wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest; and wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm is configured such that the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frames of the area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest; wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels; and wherein the high performance motion detection algorithm operates on the frames, wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution associated with a second block of pixels; and initializing a model of the area comprising multiple weighted distributions for each block of pixels.

However, Monroe discloses using a high speed motion detection algorithm to remove frames in which a threshold of motion is not detected (see page 4, paragraph [0032], [0033]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2621

at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe) as a whole is silent in regards to wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution that does not represent any motion of interest; wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution and wherein wherein the high performance motion detection algorithm operates on the frames, wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution associated with a second block of pixels; and initializing a model of the area comprising multiple weighted distributions for each block of pixels.

However, Flickner teaches wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Since Flickner discloses to

Art Unit: 2621

determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution associated with a lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed limitation); a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest wherein the high performance motion detection algorithm operates on the frames, wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution associated with a second block of pixels (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Further disclosed is that shopping carts themselves (and moving inanimate objects generally) may be detected using color (step 140). The color of shopping carts may be modeled using a single 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that has a color similar to that distribution being classified as a pixel belonging to a shopping cart, [0032]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner

Art Unit: 2621

teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution, and distinguish objects using a 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that a color similar to distribution, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner discloses to represent foreground and background pixel in different color distributions associated with the presence of motion of the lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickner with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe) for allowing for more efficient tracking of persons and activities [0004].

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) is silent in regards to the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected.

However, Gu teaches the pixel distributions are pre-selected (column 4 lines 11-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) for providing efficient signal processing of color images.

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker and Gu) is silent in regards to the color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frame of the area.

However, Parker discloses where in the present invention, the skin detection algorithm utilizes color image segmentation and a pre-determined skin distribution in a specific color space, as: P (skin.vertline.chrominace). Therefore, since Parker discloses a predetermined skin distribution in a specific color space, it is clear to the examiner that

Art Unit: 2621

the predetermined specific color space is prior to an image, which reads upon the claimed limitation.

Now taking the teachings of Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker, and Gu) now incorporating Parkers teaching of predetermined color space prior to image, now teaches claim 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Parker with Palvidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, and Gu) for providing improved image processing.

Regarding **claim 17**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, Parker) is silent in regards to the frames comprise blocks of pixels, and wherein a number of weighted distributions per block is varied. However, Monroe discloses wherein the frames comprise blocks of pixels, and wherein a number of weighted distributions per block are varied (Monroe, continuous variable; page 9, paragraph [0121]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner and Gu) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 18**, Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu and Parker), further teaches the number of weighted distributions varies (Monroe, continuous variable; page 9, paragraph [0121]) between 1 and 5 (Pavlidis, see VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking, page 1485).

Regarding **claim 19**, (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu and Parker),, as a whole further teach the number of weighted distributions is varied based on dynamics of motions or expectations (Pavlidis, VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking, *Model Update When a Match is Found*, pg. 1486-1487).

Regarding **claim 20**, (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu and Parker),, as a whole further teach the model is based on N successive frames and the weight is based on a count (Pavlidis, VI. Object segmentation and Tracking, *A. Initialization* page 1484-1485)

Regarding **claim 21**, see analysis and rejection of claim 16. Furthermore, a predefined number of weighted distributions are selected for each block of pixels, and wherein the weights are normalized as claimed are discussed in the combined teaching of Monroe and Pavlidis (mixture of Normals; Pavlidis, *III. Relevant Technical Work*, page 1481 and VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking: *A. Initializing*, page 1485).

Regarding **claim 22**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), as a whole further teach if pixels in a new frame match the model, the model weights and distributions are updated (Pavlidis, VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking: *A. Initializing*, page 1485).

Regarding **claim 23**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), as a whole further teach a (modified Jeffery's measure) is used to determine a match or non-match in the distributions (Pavlidis; VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking, *B Segmentation of Moving Objects: The Matching Operation*, page 1486).

Regarding **claim 24**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), as a whole further teach a predetermined number of frames have pixels or blocks that do not match

Art Unit: 2621

the model, the lowest weighted distributions of the pixels or blocks of a background are removed from the model and replaced by ones derived from a foreground distribution once a derived number of sequences is reached within the last N successive frames (Pavlidis, VI. Object Segmentation and Tracking *B. Segmentation of Moving Objects: Model Update When a Match is Not Found*; page 1487).

Regarding **claim 25**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), is silent in regards to the high speed motion detection algorithm operates in a compressed image domain.

However, Monroe teaches wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm operates in a compressed image domain (see Monroe, page 4, paragraph [0029]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 26**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), is silent in regards to the high speed motion detection algorithm operates in an uncompressed image domain.

However, Monroe teaches wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm operates in an uncompressed image domain (in Monroe, the calculation of the difference between two images is tabulated uncompressed or compressed, see page 4, paragraph [0032], also page 16, paragraph 0212, optionally compressed).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker) with the teaching of Monroe for providing computational efficiency and minimizing the amount of data to be transmitted without any loss of critical change data (Monroe, [0054]).

Regarding **claim 28**, Pavlidis (modified by Flickner, Gu, and Parker), are silent in regards to wherein the first color pixel distribution is pre- selected by an operator.

However, Gu teaches the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected by an operator (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner and Parker) for providing efficient signal processing of color images.

Regarding **claim 29**, Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu and Parker) is silent in regard to The method of claim 1, wherein the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected by an automated image contextual classifier.

However, Flickner teaches to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the

Art Unit: 2621

examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution associated with a lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed limitation);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickner with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe for allowing for more efficient tracking of persons and activities [0004].

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) is silent in regards to pre-select the color distributions.

However Gu teaches to pre-select the color distributions (column 4 line 11-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Flickner) for providing efficient signal processing of color images.

Regarding **claim 30**, Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, Gu, and Parker) is silent in regards to The method of claim 1, comprising analyzing the frame as a function of a resolution of a region of interest in the frame.

However, Flickner teaches analyzing the frame as a function of a resolution of a region of interest in the frame ([0025])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickner with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe and Gu) for allowing for more efficient tracking of persons and activities [0004].

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe et al., US-2003/0025599 in view of Pavlidis et al.: Urban Surveillance Systems, 2001 in

Art Unit: 2621

view of Flickner et al., US-2003/0107649 A1 and in further view of Gu et al., US-5,874,988 and further in view of Parker et al., US-2003/0122942 A1.

Regarding **claim 27**, Monroe teaches A system for detecting motion in a monitored area, the system comprising: means for receiving video images of the monitored area; a fast video motion segmentation (VMS) module that rejects still images that do not portray any motion (motion of the fan is not detected as motion, and does not cause unnecessary transmission and storage of still image data, page 9 [0121, and; a robust VMS module that detects motion of an object in the monitored area (remote area; page 3 [0026]); and a resource management controller that initializes , controls, and adapts the fast and robust VMS modules; wherein the robust VMS module (adaptive; page 9 [0123 and page 10 [0124. Monroe discloses that the system is adaptive, thus necessitates a controller to initialize control, and adapt the system for motion detection). Monroe is silent in regards to wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest, and wherein the high speed motion detection algorithm is configured such that the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving video images of the monitored area, as a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest, ;and wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution associated with the first block of pixels and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution associated with a second block of pixels.

However, However, Flickner teaches wherein a plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with a first pixel color distribution associated with a first block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's view over time [0025]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution associated with a lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed limitation); a function of the block of pixels that does not represent any motion of interest wherein the plurality of the frames comprises a selected portion of a frame with the first pixel color distribution and another portion of the frame with a second pixel color distribution (Flickner teaches in the first stage, a temporal median filter is applied to several seconds of video (typically 20-40 seconds) to distinguish "moving pixels" (pixels corresponding to moving objects) from "stationary pixels" (pixels corresponding to stationary objects) by monitoring color and assuming that a color that predominates at a given pixel over time is representative of the background image, since any object corresponding to a foreground image is expected to move in and out of the camera's

Art Unit: 2621

view over time [0025]. Further disclosed is that shopping carts themselves (and moving inanimate objects generally) may be detected using color (step 140). The color of shopping carts may be modeled using a single 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that has a color similar to that distribution being classified as a pixel belonging to a shopping cart, [0032]. Since Flickner discloses to determine moving pixel from stationary pixels by monitoring color and to predominate at a given time to be considered background, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner teaches to have a portion of the frame that is stationary represented with a color distribution, and distinguish objects using a 3-D Gaussian distribution, with the pixel of any foreground silhouette pixel that a color similar to distribution, it is clear to the examiner that Flickner discloses to represent foreground and background pixel in different color distributions associated with the presence of motion of the lack of motion as a condition, which reads upon the claimed invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flickner with Monroe for allowing for more efficient tracking of persons and activities [0004].

Monroe (modified by Flickner) is silent in regards to the first color pixel distribution is pre-selected.

However, Gu teaches the pixel distributions are pre-selected (column 4 lines 11-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gu with Monroe (modified by Flickner) for providing efficient signal processing of color images.

Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker and Gu) is silent in regards to the color pixel distribution is pre-selected, prior to the receiving the frame of the area.

However, Parker discloses where in the present invention, the skin detection algorithm utilizes color image segmentation and a pre-determined skin distribution in a specific color space, as: P (skin.vertline.chrominance), [0045]. Therefore, since Parker discloses a predetermined skin distribution in a specific color space, it is clear to the examiner that the predetermined specific color space is prior to an image, which reads upon the claimed limitation.

Now taking the teachings of Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flicker, and Gu) now incorporating Parkers teaching of predetermined color space prior to image, now teaches claim 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Parker with Pavlidis (modified by Monroe, Flickner, and Gu) for providing improved image processing.

### ***Conclusion***

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSICA ROBERTS whose telephone number is (571)270-1821. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 EST Monday-Friday, Alt Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621  
/Jessica Roberts/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621